

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Office Action dated September 26, 2007. In response to the issues raised, the Applicant offers the following submissions and amendments.

### Amendments

Claims 1, 11 and 31 have been amended to delete the terms identified in the §112 rejection. Independent claims 1, 11 and 31 have also been amended to highlight the elements that distinguish the present invention from the prior art.

Accordingly, the amendments do not add any new matter.

### 35 U.S.C. §112 - Claims 1, 11 and 31

We respectfully submit that amended claims 1, 11 and 31 only define structural elements that carry patentable weight within their respective definitions of the present invention.

### 35 U.S.C. §102 - Claims 1, 7 to 9, 11, 17 to 19, 31, 37 to 39

Claims 1, 7 to 9, 11, 17 to 19, 31, 37 to 39 stand rejected for lack of novelty in light of US 6,310,639 to Kawamura et al.

Independent claims 1, 11, and 31 have been amended to explicitly define that each of the nozzles in the array is supplied with ink via its own respective liquid passage. This restricts the invention to printhead that have a structure with each nozzle having its own individually associated liquid passage such that there are no shared or common ink conduits through the supporting wafer substrate. This has particular benefits in eliminating fluidic crosstalk between adjacent nozzles.

In contrast, the cited reference uses a large tapered trench 327 etched into the liquid supply side of the wafer substrate 303 in order to supply an entire row of the nozzles 320. Accordingly the cited printhead does not disclose an array of nozzles that each have their own individual liquid passage extending through to the liquid supply side of the wafer. Furthermore there is no suggestion that the nozzles 320 could be individually associated with their own respective liquid passage extending through the wafer substrate 303 or the function advantages that this would provide.

The citation fails to teach a fundamental aspect of the invention and does not anticipate independent claims 1, 11 and 31 or any of dependent claims 7 to 9, 17 to 19, 37 to 39.

### 35 U.S.C. §103 - Claims 2 to 6, 10, 12 to 16, 20, 32 to 36 and 40

Claims 2 to 5, 12 to 15, 32 to 35 stand rejected as obvious in light of Kawamura. Claims 10, 20 and 40 stand rejected as obvious in light of Kawamura as applied to claim 1, in view of US 5,581,284 to Hermanson. Claims 6, 16 and 36 stand rejected as obvious in light of Kawamura as applied to claim 1, in view of US 6,575,566 to Jeanmaire et al.

As discussed above, Kawamura fails to anticipate all the elements of claims 1, 11 or 31. Furthermore, the additional citations fail to teach the distinguishing features of the independent claims. Accordingly, the combined disclosures of Kawamura and the additional references fail to support a §103 rejection of any of dependent claims 2 to 6, 10, 12 to 16, 20, 32 to 36 and 40.

**Conclusion**

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed and the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



---

Kia Silverbrook

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)  
Telephone: +612 9818 6633  
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762